REMARKS

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1-28 are pending in the present application, with Claims 1, 20, and 26 being independent. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 7, 12, 15, and 20 herein. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

In the Office Action dated March 24, 2005, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses that rejection.

Applicant submits that the specification includes working examples of how to determine the assignments and calculate assignments and routes according to the variables claimed. Specifically, Fig. 5 and page 7, line 26 to page 9, line 2 describes how the electronic dispatch system (EDS) software module creates an assignment solution by describing the cost formula and defining the variables and parameters of the formula. Furthermore, Fig. 6 and page 9, line 3 through page 11, line 11 reveals an example representing the combinations of potential assignments and the calculations of the assignment solution cost that are performed by the EDS software module. Finally, Fig. 8 and page 12, lines 1-11 provide an example of how the routing algorithm as described at page 11, lines 12-30 creates a routing solution.

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to read the specifications sections cited above along with the rest of the specification and determine how to calculate the potential assignments and routes and determine an efficient assignment and route, without undue experimentation. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 2, 7, 12, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for lacking antecedent basis for certain

claim terms. First, the Applicant respectfully believes the Examiner intended to cite Claim 1 instead of Claim 2 based on the claim terms of "the software program" and "the selected assignments and routes." Therefore, Applicant has amended independent Claim 1 to provide proper antecedent basis. Furthermore, Applicant has amended dependent Claims 7, 12, and 15 to provide proper antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. US 6,278,965 to Glass et al. (hereinafter Glass). Applicant respectfully traverses that rejection.

Independent Claim 26

The rejection of Claim 26 is respectfully traversed. Applicant submits that the document cited by the Examiner fails to describe, teach, or suggest at least the feature of a server computer connected to the central computer system operating an electronic dispatch software module for calculating baggage assignments and routes based on the passenger data, baggage data, and flight data, as presently recited in independent Claim 26.

The Glass reference describes a ground traffic management system used for the tracking, movement, and scheduling of multiple vehicles. The system uses data generated at different rates and by multiple heterogeneous incompatible data sources that can electronically interconnect air traffic control, airline, and airport operations user communities to facilitate information sharing and improve taxi queuing.

The Examiner states that Glass discloses a server computer (104) running a software module (see Figure 1). However, Glass discloses that "[t]he overall architecture of a preferred embodiment of the present invention, a real-time surface traffic adviser 100, will be described in relation to FIG. 1. The traffic adviser 100 generally includes an executive subsystem 102, an information subsystem 104, an input management subsystem 106, a prediction subsystem 108, and a client interface subsystem 110, that are interconnected to interchange real-time aircraft

operations data between the FM, various airlines, the city Department of Aviation (airport management), and the ramp controllers." See col. 13 lines 9-18. Furthermore, "[t]he traffic adviser 100 system hardware includes *a server* and multiple workstations." See col. 14 lines 22-23. Element 104 of Glass relates to the Information Subsystem which is operable to "1) communicate traffic raw data Inputs from automatic data streams and manual inputs to the prediction subsystem; 2) provide inter-process management and control; 3) support information processing; and 4) provide system housekeeping." See col. 13, lines 38-46. Therefore, element 104 of Glass is just one subsystem that makes up a portion of the real-time surface traffic adviser 100 server and is not an individual server as cited by the Examiner. Therefore, the structure of Glass is different from the network recited in Claim 26 as element 104 of Glass does not disclose a server computer connected to the central computer system operating an electronic dispatch software module for calculating baggage assignments and routes based on the passenger data, baggage data, and flight data.

Similarly, as discussed above, Applicant submits that the Examiner misstates the structure of the "one client computer (102) coupled to a server, and a second client coupled to a server (110)." Glass discloses that element 102, the Executive Subsystem, and element 110, the Client Interface Subsystem, are located on the server. Therefore, element 102 does not disclose at least one tug client *coupled to the server computer* and operable for receiving baggage assignments and routes from the server computer and presenting baggage assignments and routes to a baggage handler, and element 110 does not disclose at least one dispatch client *coupled to the server computer* and operable for receiving assignments and routes from the server computer and distributing them to the tug clients via the server computer, as recited in independent Claim 26.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the limitations in Claim 26 are not merely recitations of intended use, but provide limitations to the system claim as supported by the specification.

In light of the differences between independent Claim 26 and the Glass reference, Applicant submits that Glass fails to teach or suggest at least the features discussed above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 26.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-16 and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,580,046 to Koini et al. (hereinafter Koini). Further, the Examiner rejected Claims 17-19 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over AAPA and Koini, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,748,320 to Jones (hereinafter Jones). Applicant respectfully traverses those rejections.

Independent Claim 1

The rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully traversed. Applicant submits that none of the documents cited by the Examiner describe, teach, or suggest at least the features of operating the software module at the server to calculate a plurality of potential assignments for baggage transfer from the data and to select an efficient solution of assignments; operating the software program at the server to calculate a plurality of potential routes for completing the assignments from the data and to select an efficient route; and electronically distributing the selected efficient solution of assignments and selected efficient routes from the server to clients connected to the distributed computer network.

A. The Combination of AAPA and Koini as Applied to Independent Claim 1

The AAPA reference

The AAPA that the Applicant submitted in the Background section of the patent application describes the conventional approach to transferring baggage from inbound flights to connecting flights. As stated at page 1, line 18 to page 2, line 2 of the application, the conventional approach utilizes a dispatcher who is responsible for organizing and managing a pool of tug drivers. The dispatcher must rely on her experience to create the quickest and most efficient assignments and routes for the tug drivers by considering several different variables.

Furthermore, after the dispatcher has calculated what she believes to be the most efficient route, the written assignments and routes must be manually passed onto the tug drivers.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the AAPA does not describe, teach, or suggest at least the features of operating the software module at the server to calculate a plurality of potential assignments for baggage transfer from the data and to select an efficient solution of assignments. The AAPA also does not disclose operating the software program at the server to calculate a plurality of potential routes for completing the assignments from the data and to select an efficient route. The AAPA teaches a system where a dispatcher must consider several variables, and based on her own experience, determine and calculate the most efficient assignments and routes for the tug drivers as quickly as possible as a number of inbound planes require the transferring of baggage to connecting flights. Thus, in the AAPA, a dispatcher does not have the time to manually calculate a plurality of potential assignment and routes and to select the most efficient assignments and routes, as presently recited in independent Claim 1. Therefore, the assignments and routes selected in the AAPA may not be the most accurate or efficient solutions.

Furthermore, the AAPA does not teach or suggest electronically distributing the selected efficient solution of assignments and selected efficient routes from the server to clients connected to the distributed computer network. As previously mentioned, the AAPA teaches a system where the written assignments and routes are manually distributed to the tug drivers for them to carry out their duties. This system does not allow the tug drivers to receive updated assignments and routes in case flight or baggage information changes. Furthermore, in the AAPA, a tug driver would have to return to the dispatcher in order to receive their next assignment. Therefore, a system where the selected efficient solution of assignments and selected efficient routes are electronically distributed from the server to clients connected to the distributed computer network, as presently recited in independent Claim 1, overcomes a major drawback of the AAPA.

The Koini Reference

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the AAPA does not disclose the use of a software module operating on a server. For that feature, the Examiner relied on the Koini reference. Koini relates to a process that provides for the automated conveying, sorting and loading of baggage items in airports having a baggage-conveying facility conveying baggage from a check-in region to a baggage area, from where they are transported for loading into aircraft.

The Examiner relied on Koini to show "the use of a software module/program for the automated conveying, sorting and loading of baggage items, which identifies flight information along with the baggage data and calculates the optimal assignments and routes." However, Applicant submits that Koini does not teach or suggest at least the features of operating the software module at the server to calculate a plurality of potential assignments for baggage transfer from the data and to select an efficient solution of assignment. Koini also fails to disclose operating the software program at the server to calculate a plurality of potential routes for completing the assignments from the data and to select an efficient route, as presently recited in Claim 1.

Koini discloses a system that records baggage properties such as weight, volume, contour, and consistency in order to determine which type of loading system to use in order to load baggage onto an airplane in an automated conveying environment. Therefore, the calculation of an optimum assignment in Koini is merely related to determining what type of loading device (i.e. purely manual; robots with exchangeable grippers; or other mechanical loading apparatuses), and not to calculating a plurality of potential assignments for baggage transfer from the data and selecting an efficient solution of assignments and calculating a plurality of potential routes for completing the assignments from the data and selecting an efficient route, as presently recited in Claim 1.

Summary of the Analysis for Independent Claim 1

In light of the differences between amended independent Claim 1 and the AAPA and Koini reference, Applicant submits that the AAPA and Koini reference, either alone or in

combination, fails to teach or suggest at least the features of operating the software module at the server to calculate a plurality of potential assignments for baggage transfer from the data and to select an efficient solution of assignments and operating the software program at the server to calculate a plurality of potential routes for completing the assignments from the data and to select an efficient route. Furthermore, the AAPA and Koini, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest electronically distributing the selected efficient solution of assignments and selected efficient routes from the server to clients connected to the distributed computer network. Applicant further submits that none of the other documents cited by the Examiner teach or suggest those features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1.

Independent Claim 20

Applicant submits that the AAPA and Koini reference, either alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest at least the features of formulating a plurality of potential assignments for transferring the items from the item data in order to select an efficient solution of assignments, and formulating a plurality of potential routes for completing the assignments from the item data in order to select an efficient route, as presently recited in independent Claim 20. Applicant submits that these features are similar to the features of Claim 1 as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent Claim 20 is also patentable over the documents of record.

Summary

Based on the above, Applicant submits that independent Claims 1, 20, and 26 are patentable over the documents cited by the Examiner. Additionally, the remaining claims depend from one of the independent claims either directly or indirectly and are submitted to be patentable for similar reasons. The dependent claims also recite additional features further defining the present invention over the cited document, and Applicant submits that the cited documents do not teach or suggest integrating those features into the presently claimed

invention. Accordingly, Applicant requests separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the foregoing as a full and complete response to the Official Action dated March 24, 2005. Applicant submits that this Amendment and Response places the application in condition for allowance and respectfully requests such action. If any issues exist that can be resolved with an Examiner's Amendment or a telephone conference, please contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at 404.572.4647.

Respectfully submitted,

Kerry L. Broome
Reg. No. 54,004

King & Spalding LLP
45th Floor
191 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
404.572.4600